DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 352 HE 013 357

AUTHOR Scott, Robert A.
TITLE The Department Chairperson: Role, Function, and Future.
PUB DATE 20 Nov 80
NOTE 28p.: Paper presented at a National League for Nursing Conference entitled "The Chairperson: Leader and Manager" (New York, NY, November 20, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility: *Administrator Role: Collective Bargaining: *College Administration: College Role: *Department Heads: Educational Change: Higher Education: Interprofessional Relationship: *Leadership Qualities: Nursing Education: Power Structure: *Role Perception: *Teacher Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

The role and responsibilities of department heads, and the effects of changing conditions in higher education, are considered, and reference is made to the nursing education department. The department represents an organizational unit as well as an intellectual discipline, and the department head is expected to serve in four roles: leader, manager, scholar, and "first among equals," (i.e., a peer who is serving a limited term as head of the group). The department head is principally concerned with three areas of potential change: mission, faculty, and curriculum. The following areas are addressed: the department head's relation to collective bargaining, the rewards a department head either controls or influences, personal qualities and leadership qualities, future concerns affecting higher education, role ambiguity and stress, maintaining quality, and indicators of organizational vitality. Suggestions for new department heads, a bibliography, and a list of indicators of organizational vitality are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196352

The Department Chairperson: Role, Function, and Future

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert A. Scott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Robert A. Scott
Director of Academic Affairs
Indiana Commission for Higher Education

Invited address presented at a National League for Nursing conference entitled "The Chairperson: Leader and Manager," New York City, November 20, 1980

HE013357

The Department Chairperson: Role, Function, and Future*

Robert A. Scott

The sociologist Robert Nisbet has used the concepts of "portrait" and "landscape" as metaphors to help examine and understand complex social facts. It seems to me that your organizers would like a portrait of a position -- the department head. This would, if successful, not only describe the position and its incumbents, but would, by a detailed rendering, reveal their character. A good portrait reveals even more when it is placed in an appropriate setting, which we might call a landscape.

My assignment, then, is to discuss department heads: who they are and what they look like in aggregate; what they do — i.e. their role and function; and why they do what they do, why what they do is important, and why what they do will be different in the future.

But first, why is a meeting like this needed? American colleges and universities have had department heads for many years; their responsibilities are well known. This is true, but change is also true. We are entering a new age -- a time of choice for students,

*Originally presented as "The Department Chairperson: Who, What, and Why?"

especially in nursing -- and a time of unprecedented challenge to administrators.[1] And since I believe that the position of department head is a key administrative role in a university, because the department is the university's basic organizational unit, it behooves us to consider the influences of these changes on the position.

According to the American Council on Education, there are nearly 80,000 department heads in American higher education.[2] Another estimate is that one of every three faculty members will serve in the post at one time or another.[3]

There are not many research reports on the department or its administrative structure, but numerous expressions of criticism about it.[4] Allegedly, it limits the growth of new fields and acts to preserve the status quo. I am not certain these criticisms are valid. Nevertheless, other expressions about the department ring true: it is the dominant agency in a college or university; it is the major vehicle for faculty involvement in governance; it is the principal part through which the major work of the university is carried out; it is a potent force in determining the stature of a university; it,

1. Clark Kerr, Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980).
2. American Council on Education, "President's Letter" (Washington, D.C., Volume 5, No. 2, June 1980), p. 3.
3. Dean E. McHenry and Associates, Academic Departments: Problems, Variations, and Alternatives (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977).
4. Kay J. Anderson, "In Defense of Departments," in Academic Departments, pp. 1 - 11.

together with the course system, forms the basic pattern of the American university; it the locus of the academic career.[5]

The department was reported to exist as an intellectual principle -- i.e., as an organizing principle for specialized knowledge -- as early as 1739.[6] In the 1800's its development was thought to be a function of organizational size and theories about the span of management control. The elective system created in the late 1800's also contributed to an emphasis on specialized knowledge and to organizing the curriculum, and hence to the development of the department.[7] According to Clark,

> The department, then, was as much an organizational as an intellectual necessity, an efficient unit for making decisions about the curriculum, student careers, and the appointments and promotion of staff, decisions that could no longer be made effectively or credibly by the president.[8]

A department, then, is an organization, and as such its members must negotiate roles, formulate values, and develop appropriate structures for it. Departments have norms, values, and myths. They are "moral

5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., p.2
7. Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 320-325.
8. Burton R. Clark, "Departments As Contexts for Teaching and Learning," in Academic Departments, p. 15.

communities" operated on the basis of shared norms. They are necessary bodies, but not constant bodies; they are fluid and dynamic.[9]

Most department heads are chosen from their department faculties on the basis of personal characteristics and scholarly competence. They are then socialized, not trained, by interactions with others. As a consequence, role expectations and feedback can result in role ambiguity and uncertainty. The department head is expected to serve successfully in four roles: as "first among equals," as leader, manager, and scholar. But it is not always clear what being "first among equals" really means. Some department heads think of themselves basically as managers, while others consider themselves leaders oriented to professional concerns or to program development. Others think of themselves as faculty, and look to faculty for feedback. But they receive direction from a dean or vice president. Still others think of themselves primarily as scholars with a mandate to lead their department academically.[10]

9. John R. Kimberly, Robert H. Miles, and Associates, The Organizational Life Cycle: Issues in The Creation, Transformation, and Decline of Organizations (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), Chapter 1.
10. Ann Kieffer Bragg, "Relationship Between the Role Definition and Socialization of Academic Department Heads" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1980).

Criteria for the selection of department heads are vague; they seldom receive a charge as they undertake their duties; and they receive little in the way of performance evaluation from deans. While appointment as chairperson for life was standard at the turn of the century, five years seems to be the norm now, with an increasing pattern of a three year appointment followed by the possibility of one extension to the term.

At many schools, especially it seems at two year colleges in which the faculty have organized into collective bargaining units, the department headship is a nearly permanent position granted by the administration. At other institutions, the temptation is great to permit the successful chairperson (i.e., the one who demonstrates the qualities and arts of leadership considered ideal) to remain in the post as long as he or she is willing. But, as Douglas Brown has said, "succumbing to this temptation is usually a mistake." He has sage advice.

> No matter how much such a chairman has learned to delegate and no matter how adequate his supporting staff, the responsibility for leadership does take its toll on the intellectual energy and personal freedom needed to advance a scholarly career. Further, an able chairman, over time, is bound to encourage other senior members of the department to enjoy a lesser degree of responsibility than is conducive to true partnership in the determining of policies in a department... Moreover, because successful departments tend to become smug and cozy, they benefit from new leadership... Even the best

> symphony orchestras do better if different conductors test their capabilities from time to time."[11]

A one or two year term is too short to learn the nuances of an organizaion and to implement one's ideas. A ten year term is probably too long to encourage the benefits of rotation described above. Therefore, the three to five year term seems ideal for the department as an organization and for the faculty member who as department head must serve multiple roles.

For a volunteer who is considered "first among equals," i.e. a peer who is serving a limited term as head of the group, the department head has numerous responsibilities. He, or she, must work with the department, other faculties and department heads, the dean, the central administration, and the profession -- and still satisfy institutional expectations for his or her own scholarship. The department head is responsible for the orientation of new faculty, faculty evaluation, development, and vitality, faculty morale, student retention and development, program review, and department quality. The department chair must also organize teaching and advising schedules, the curriculum and admissions committees, and financial management procedures. Additional responsibilities include grievance procedures, conveying department objectives to the central administration, and relating university goals to department members.[12]

---

11. J. Douglas Brown, "Departmental and University Leadership," in Academic Departments, pp. 193-194.
12. Dean E. McHenry and Associates, loc. cit.

The department head is principally concerned with three areas of potential change: mission, faculty, and curriculum. One can easily see how the professional lives of nurse chairpersons are affected by proposals to change all three as part of the process of installing a new philosophy about the first professional degree in nursing.

It might be useful to say something about the department head's relation to collective bargaining. According to Mortimer and McConnell, there is considerable ambiguity about whether department chairpersons are management or labor.

> (There appear to be three grounds on which individuals can be excluded from bargaining units: their supervisory responsibilities, the management title, and the fact that they handle confidential information.)
>
> To determine whether to include department chairmen in the unit with the faculty, a labor relations board must judge the extent to which chairmen make effective, independent recommendaions to their superiors. If the board determines that the chairman is merely a senior colleague among colleagues who forwards the collegium's recommendations to superior authorities, it is likely to conclude that the position should be in the bargaining unit with the faculty.
>
> Whether inclusion of department chairmen in the bargaining unit or their exclusion from it will significantly affect their role is a subject for future research. There is some evidence that in institutions where the chairmen are in the unit, management has found it necessary to transfer some authority from the chairmanship up to the next level of supervision (Mortimer and Richardson, 1977). The argument is that it is next to impossible to require a member of the bargaining unit to discipline or supervise activities of other members of the bargaining unit. Similarly, when a grievance

> procedure is negotiated, it is difficult to ask a member of the unit, the department chairman, to participate in the first step of the procedure.[13]

In any discussion of roles and functions, one must inevitably discuss power. While the primary power or authority for a department head is that called auctoritas -- or moral influence — the incumbent does have rewards to use as incentives.[14] But he or she must be careful. Universities and colleges are dependent upon normative rather than on utilitarian or coercive bonds. Shared values must dominate or the leader's power will no longer be legitimate, no matter whether his administrative style is weighted toward the faculty or the central administration.[15] Nevertheless, there are numerous rewards or incentives at the disposal of the chairperson. All too often, though, they are either dissipated or ignored. But just think of the rewards a department head either controls or can influence greatly: salary recommendations, promotions, teaching loads, teaching schedules, sabbatical leaves, leaves of absence, course assignments, committee assignments (admission, curriculum, salary review, promotion), relief from committee assignments, discretionary funds, teaching and research assistance, typing help, special assignments, and endorsements for

13. Kenneth R. Mortimer and T.R. McConnell, Sharing Authority Effectively: Participation, Interaction, and Discretion (San Francisco: Jossey- Bass, 1978), pp. 66 and 67.
14. Burton R. Clark, "The Wesleyan Story: The Importance of Moral Capital," in Academic Transformation (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. 381.
15. Robert A. Scott, "The 'Amateur Dean' in a Complex University: An Essay on Role Ambiguity," Liberal Education (Volume 65, 1979), pp. 445-452.

research proposals, fellowship applications, and summer support requests. The chairperson can also reward by seeking advice and by offering praise, whether in private or in public. It is in these ways that faculty development is really department development, and vice versa.[16]

With such power there is of course also a responsibility for ethical concerns. An absence of integrity will soon reduce the "powers" of office.[17]

The particular demands on a department head vary greatly and are at least in part a consequence of department size. In a department of three or four faculty and one secretary, the chairperson may indeed be an amateur who convenes his colleagues as a "committee of the whole." In a large department with several dozen faculty, graduate and post-doctoral students, research assistants, technicians, and secretaries, the wise chairperson will have a full-time executive officer and bylaws that specify organizational principles and departmental procedures. Nevertheless, it is important for all chairpersons to know about institutional services to call upon for technical assistance.

16. John M. Bevan, "Faculty Evaluation and Institutional Rewards," AAHE Bulletin (Washington, D.C., American Association for Higher Education, Volume 33, No. 2, October 1980), pp. 1, 3-4, 14-17.
17. Reinhard Bendix, Kings or People (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978) p. 17.

As with all managers and administrators, department heads must combine leadership traits, communication skills, and a sense of tradition to achieve a constructive resolution of tensions. In addition, the department chair must solve three organizational dilemmas: organizational design -- which concerns how desired results are generated; political allocation -- which concerns how power is distributed; and the ideological and cultural mix -- which concerns how ascendent values are determined.[18]

The department head as leader, according to J. Douglas Brown, must represent the "whole department as a continuing organization which must, to be effective, have impartial and judicious leadership in the consideration of personnel actions, budgets, curricular programs, and research projects."[19] The effective chairperson must have intuitive integrity and a personal set of values which guide his or her actions; respect for others, and a sense of organization and the need for parties to work together toward common objectives; foresight in anticipating problems and an openness in the discussion of issues; a sense of balance about the diverse approaches to learning and the varied subareas of instruction and scholarship represented in his or her field; and a recognition of the need for the chairmanship to rotate -- because the department is a body of colleagues in which leadership is shared.[20]

18. Kimberly and Miles, Loc. cit.
19. J. Douglas Brown, "Departmental and University Leadership," in Academic Departments, p. 190.
20. Ibid., pp. 188 - 198.

The portrait is nearly complete. Let us now look at the setting and its possible influences on the department head, especially the nurse educator serving his or her turn as the first among equals.

The decade ahead has been called by numerous commentators a "golden age for students." Never before has access to post-high school study been greater, choice been more abundant, the real price of education lower, or the expected return on investment in higher education greater. Yet, in spite of this good news for society, many college administrators issue pessimistic projections about the future of collegiate institutions. They express concern about declining enrollments, aging faculties, and rising costs that outstrip income. It is true that the next ten to twenty years will be an age of unprecedented challenge to institutions, but they will also be an age of great opportunity.

After a decade of developing and refining the tools of financial analysis and management information systems, higher education will in all likelihood experience a decade devoted to people problems. Major concerns will include 1) student recruitment and development (minority student needs; the returning student; the older and part-time student; the temporary student; etc.); 2) faculty vitality (maintaining competence in both subject matter and instructional technologies; maintaining the balance between student interests and faculty expertise; responding to new educational needs without making long-term financial commitments; etc.); and 3) administrative actions (strategies for encouraging innovation; new incentive and reward systems for faculty and staff; administrative operations reviews as well as

academic program reviews; affirmative action; staff development; reductions in force; etc.). These concerns are extensive and serious.

Several of these problems have special poignancy for nurse educators. There are new expectations about the educational level of nursing faculty, new expectations about the form of training suitable for preparing as a professional nurse, and a declining member of 17-21 year olds interested in nursing as a career -- even among those interested in health care.[21]

In addition -- and partly as a consequence of these forces — nurse educators face greater role ambiguity and stress. No longer does the nurse department head face role expectations from a defined set of colleagues, associations, and central administrators; now employers demand more nurses, legislators want immediate cures for the shortage of nurses in urban hospitals, state agencies refuse to permit claims of "professional standards" to interfere with their notion of educational requirements, and health planners say that funding for nurse education can be reduced because there are now enough of them.

These competing forces result in what sociologists call "role overload." The department head starts out trying to balance the roles of scholar, manager, and educational leader, but finds the greatest emphasis on the managerial role. This, however, results in added

---

21. Robert A. Scott, "The Evolution of Roles and Aspirations: Burgeoning Choices for Females" (Indianapolis: Indiana Health Careers, March 20, 1980).

frustration because of the imbalance between accountability expected and authority granted. For in times of uncertainty, such as these, accountability tends to become decentralized while authority becomes increasingly centralized. The result is greater role ambiguity and stress.

The increased demand for accountability, though, is often not accompanied by an increased amount or frequency of feedback. So the department head faces a larger number and variety of performance expectations but no greater prospect for information about her performance.[22] And in new circumstances such as these, there are fewer role models to consult. Past chairmen, faculty mentors, and others are inadequate models for study. In addition, there is greater emphasis, in this new era, on two functions which have insufficient definition. One is the maintenance of quality; the other is the monitoring of department health.

One source of difficulty in understanding quality is that many commentators speak as if there is, or should be, a single metric for it. Others concentrate on "inputs," "outputs," or "value added." In fact, quality is too often thought of as an adjective, as in "quality program", when it is a noun. The term quality represents certain characteristics — including effectiveness -- of an activity. It

22. Bragg, loc. cit.

represents an informed judgment about the attainment of distinctive goals in a manner that respects resources.

In order more fully to appreciate the idea of quality, it might be helpful to consider how one measures the quality of "wind." To distinguish the difference between wind of high and low quality, one must know the purpose for which it is being used, the circumstances or context of the activity, and the resources being employed. For example, a sailor has a particular context -- a boat in the water -- and his or her attainment can be measured in terms of purpose, achievement, and efficiency by those who understand the behavior of water and know how to discern the characteristic features of a boat. However, the quality of wind desired by the sailor is not the same as that sought by the farmer who is sowing seeds. The purposes, contexts, values, and achievements are different, and so are the measures of success and of quality.

In like manner, when considering the quality of academic programs, one must consider purposes, or goals; the congruence between program goals and institutional goals, which inevitably must be congruent with societal or patron values and goals; the use of resources; the context in which the activities of the program take place; and the degree to which the program attains its goals or peak performance. One might ask what would be lost if the program did not exist. Only when these characteristics are known -- and some, such as peak performance, can be known only when the evaluator is experienced in the field -- can one make a judgment about the quality of a program. There is no metric to

be used, although there are indicators and universal criteria. In the end, there is only judgment based on practice, which is true whether one is reviewing an academic major, a faculty member for promotion, or a student services program. For judgments about quality are judgments about ends and values, about appropriateness and worth; they are not only about means and methods.

I subscribe to the notion that quality represents the attainment of appropriate goals; that is, effectiveness in achieving objectives. In these terms, excellence means the superior attainment of valued and distinctive goals. And, while objectives vary and indicators of activity are numerous, in the final analysis quality is most often made known by an informed judgment based on shared understandings.[23]

The new circumstances also place great emphasis on management, finance, and planning. I prefer to think of planning as on-going, not as a single event which occurs only when requested. The department chair is responsible for monitoring the vitality of his or her department.

It is just as important to assess the health of a department or an institution as it is the health of an individual. And just as there are signs of physical health to monitor, there are indicators

23. The preceding discussion of quality is from Robert A. Scott, "Program Review's Missing Member: A Consideration of Quality and its Assessment," The College Board Review (Winter 1981).

of institutional or organizational vitality. Some are indicators of financial condition in general, while others signal specific features of the educational environment.

The need for particular indicators will vary by area of responsibility, by goal, by project, and even by season. The important point is for educators to recognize the need for indicators of organizational vitality and progress, and to monitor regularly those which are crucial to achieving new goals or to maintaining the status quo.

The list included as Appendix "A" is not an exhaustive inventory. However, it should suggest a number of appropriate signals which might be chosen for monitoring an organization's condition at regular intervals, even if each indicator is not relevant to the condition of every department or institution. New indicators may be developed as a result of planning exercises which consider the national and regional structure of higher education, the status of the institution in relation to competing institutions, environmental factors, and temporal conditions.

Indicators should be monitored at standard intervals over a period of years. In this way, changes in condition and effectiveness may be tracked, and corrective action may be defined with greater precision.

The most appropriate indicators are related directly to the primary services of undergraduate and graduate instruction, research, and

community service. Changes in the conditions of such indicators should give useful clues about the vitality of these services over a period of time, and the changing condition of both major resources -- students, faculty, grants, support staff, supplies, etc. -- and the social and economic environment in which the institution exists. Such indicators are usually more useful than national, regional, or institutional averages -- which belie differences in distribution and kind -- and can help the department head in negotiations with the central administration.[24]

An additional complication to the function of the nursing department head is the need for new partnerships in nursing education. After a period of time when educators went in one pedagogical direction and nursing service went another, there is renewed attention to the clinical component of nursing education and the partnerships that can exist between educators and practitioners. These involve new forms of contracts for facilities and services, and other new relationships.

In closing, I would offer some ideas for assisting the new department head and for refreshing the repertoire of those who have been in office. First, I think it is useful to have a bibliography, and I suggest three items I find useful. The first is Ann Kieffer Bragg's 1980 doctoral dissertation from Penn State University entitled, "Relationship Between the Role Definition and Socialization of

24. The preceding discussion of indicators, and Appendix "A," are from Robert A. Scott, "Indicators of Institutional Vitality," mimeographed (Indianapolis: Indiana Commission for Higher Education, 1980).

Academic Department Heads." The second is "Academic Departments" by Dean McHenry and others. And third -- but not last, there are a number of useful items — "Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership," by Charles F. Fisher. These and others are noted in the bibliography.

There is much that department heads can do as individuals and as members of an organization such as NLN. For example, you can conduct workshops on campus. After all, department heads share problems as department heads -- most problems are not specific to a field or a discipline.[25] Such workshops might emphasize long range planning and strategies, the monitoring of department health, and budget development, by which I do not mean only cost and fund accounting, but budget procedures and philosophy. For example, in Indiana, the biennial budget has four components: a) price changes, or the projected effects of inflation; b) quantity changes, or increases or decreases in enrollment or other quantitative measures of instructional, research, and service activities; c) program change, or the increase or decrease in funding needed to start or stop instructional, research, or service activities; and d) quality maintenance and improvement requests, the category which permits the state to act as a private foundation both in selecting and supporting special efforts that will contribute to the maintenance or improvement of institutional program quality. Too few department

25. Robert A. Scott, Lords, Squires, and Yeomen: Collegiate Middle-Managers and their Organizations (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1978), pp. 59-61.

heads and deans become familiar with these procedures and possibilities, so they lose out.

Personnel management is another topic of importance: retirement rules, recruiting regulations, laws governing working conditions and benefits -- all are important -- and not so arcane. You can work with campus colleagues to develop a department head's manual which includes key legislation, the institution's charter, policy statements, memoranda from the dean on salary, overhead, and expense items, extra personnel forms, etc. You can arrange to have overlapping periods of office for incoming and outgoing chairpersons; appoint subchairmanships for particular responsibilities; employ an assistant -- whether it is a student to help with a research project or an executive officer who manages the financial and personnel systems of the department. The latter may require the department to give up a faculty position, but it may decide as others have that it is worth it for continuity and support to the principle of the " amateur" or scholarly department head. Others have arranged for experienced department heads to become mentors for new ones. The ideas are numerous.

This concludes my portrait, my landscape, and my rendering of a few detailed ideas. I offer just one final thought. We must always remember why we are engaged in this dialogue. As educators, we must do the best job possible in providing a meaningful education for the betterment of society. As department heads, we are in a position to make it happen.

Thank you.

Appendix "A"

INDICATORS OF ORGANIZATIONAL VITALITY

Indicators	Measure	Source of Data
- Yield on offers of admission to applicants	Ratio	Admissions Office
- Yield on offers of admission to top 1/3 of applicants	SAT, ACT, classrank	Admissions Office
- Applications for admission per spaces available	Ratio	Admissions Office
- Inquiries for admission per spaces available	Ratio	Admissions Office
- Transfers in	Number	Admissions Office
- Admission offers made per total applicants and intended size of class	Ratio	Admissions Office
- Academic quality of entering students	SAT, ACT, classrank	Admissions Office
- Proportion of students by source: USA, Other, Public Schools, Private Schools, etc.	Number, ratio	Admissions Office
- Cost of recruiting each new student	$	Admissions Office
- Actual secondary school preparation of new students	No. years of selected subjects	Registrar
- Degree to which first year students exceed minimum standards	No. years of subjects	Registrar
- Transfers out	Number	Registrar
- Enrollments in fundamental science courses	Number	Registrar
- Enrollments in general education courses	Number	Registrar

- Enrollments in programs not central to institution's mission	Number	Registrar
- Enrollments in programs central to institution's mission	Number	Registrar
- Total enrollment	Number	Registrar
- FTE faculty per FTE students	Number, ratio	Registrar
- Full time faculty per FTE students	Number, ratio	Registrar
- Graduate and professional school placement of graduates	Ratio	Chief Academic Officer
- Retention rate of students	Ratio	Chief Academic Officer
- Graduation rate of students	Ratio	Chief Academic Officer
- Degrees granted by academic area	Number	Chief Academic Officer
- Morale of students	Statements on survey	Chief Academic Officer
- Non-institutional awards and honors received by students	Number	Chief Academic Officer
- Yield on offers to most desired faculty	Ratio	Chief Academic Officer
- Number of faculty leaving voluntarily to accept positions at other institutions	Number, ratio	Chief Academic Officer
- Number of involuntary resignations of junior faculty	Number, ratio	Chief Academic Officer
- Number of faculty leaving voluntarily to accept non-teaching employment	Number, ratio	Chief Academic Officer
- Number of faculty spending sabbatical leaves on campus	Number, ratio	Chief Academic Officer
- Department support personnel per faculty member	Number, ratio	Chief Academic Officer

- New courses developed	Number, ratio	Chief Academic Officer
- Number of degree programs and titles on campus	Number, ratio	Chief Academic Officer
- Publications per faculty member	Number, ratio	Chief Academic Officer
- Proportion of faculty holding tenure	Number, ratio	Chief Academic Officer
- Faculty morale	Statements on survey	Chief Academic Officer
- Research/scholarship activity by faculty	Number	Chief Academic Officer
- National or regional professional activity by faculty	Number	Chief Academic Officer
- Number of grant proposals	Number	Chief Academic Officer
- External research support per faculty	$, number	Chief Academic Officer
- Research productivity	Patents, discoveries etc.	Chief Academic Officer
- Awards and honors received by faculty	Number	Chief Academic Officer
- FTE technicians, etc. per FTE faculty member	Number, ratio	Chief Academic Officer
- Expenditures for instructional materials and equipment	$, % of budget	Chief Academic Officer
- Expenditures for library materials for instruction and research	$, % of budget	Chief Academic Officer
- Expenditures for instructional and research computing	$, % of budget	Chief Academic Officer
- Number of advanced undergraduate courses taught by part-time faculty or graduate students	Number	Chief Academic Officer

- Percentage of students who gain direct experience with new technologies and and equipment	Ratio	Chief Academic Officer
- Complaints about teaching	Number	Chief Academic Officer
- Internships, assistantships, and other experiences gained by students	Number by type	Chief Academic Officer
- Financial aid resources per student available from institutional funds	$	Chief Financial Officer
- Expenditures for routine maintenance	$	Chief Financial Officer
- Expenditures for planned maintenance	$	Chief Financial Officer
- Proportion of instructional expenditures per total operating expenses	$, ratio	Chief Financial Officer
- Proportion of instructional activities supported by temporary or grant funds	$, ratio	Chief Financial Officer
- Job placement of graduates	Number of placements	Career Counseling Officer
- Scores of students on graduate and professional school entrance examinations and on licensing examinations	Scores	Career Counseling Officer
- Circulation of library books	Number	Librarian
- Community Service	Hours, projects	Public Affairs Office
- Visitors to campus events	Number	Public Affairs Office
- Accomplishments of alumni	Number by occupation and honor	Alumni Office
- Involvement of alumni in institutional programs	Number, ratio	Alumni Office
- Crime and vandalism on campus	Number of incidents reported	Campus Security Officer

- Institutional leadership	Evaluation	Trustees
- Academic leadership	Evaluation	Chief Executive Officer

Bibliography

American Council on Education, "President's Letter" (Washington, D.C., Volume 5 No. 2, June 1980).

Anderson, Kay J., "In Defense of Departments," in Academic Departments: Problems, Variations, and Alternatives, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977).

Bendix, Reinhard, Kings or People (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978).

Bevan, John M., "Faculty Evaluation and Institutional Rewards," AAHE Bulletin (Washington, D.C., American Association for Higher Education, Volume 33, No. 2, October 1980).

Booth, David B., "Department and Chairperson Development" in Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership, Charles F. Fisher, editor (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Volume VI, Number 2, 1978).

Bragg, Ann Kieffer, "Relationship Between the Role Definition and Socialization of Academic Department Heads" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1980).

Brown, J. Douglas, "Departmental and University Leadership," in Academic Departments.

Clark, Burton R., "The Wesleyan Story: The Importance of Moral Capital," in Academic Transformation (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973).

Clark, Burton R., "Departments As Contexts for Teaching and Learning," in Academic Departments.

Corson, John J., The Governance of Colleges and Universities (McGraw-Hill, 1960).

Dressel, Paul, Craig Johnson, and Philip Marcus, The Confidence Crisis: An Analysis of University Departments (San Francisco: Jossey-Ball, 1970).

Fisher, Charles F., editor, Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Volume VI, Number 2, 1978).

Kerr, Clark, Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980).

Kimberly, John R., Robert H. Miles, and Associates, The Organizational Life Cycle: Issues in the Creation, Transformation, and Decline of Organizations (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980).

McHenry, Dean E. and Associates, Academic Departments: Problems, Variations, and Alternatives (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977).

Mortimer, Kenneth R., and T. R. McConnell, Sharing Authority Effectively: Participation, Interaction, and Discretion (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978).

Scott, Robert A., Lords, Squires, and Yeomen: Collegiate Middle Managers and Their Organizations (Washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1978).

Scott, Robert A., "The 'Amateur Dean' in a Complex University: An Essay on Role Ambiguity," Liberal Education (Volume 65, 1979, pp. 445-452).

Scott, Robert A., "Indicators of Institutional Vitality," mimeographed (Indianapolis: Indiana Commission for Higher Education, 1980).

Scott, Robert A., "The Evolution of Roles and Aspirations: Burgeoning Choices for Females" (Indianapolis: Indiana Health Careers, March 20, 1980).

Scott, Robert A., "Program Review's Missing Member: A Consideration of Quality and its Assessment," The College Board Review (Winter 1981).

Trow, Martin, "The American Academic Department as a Context for Learning," Studies in Higher Education (Vol. 1, No. 1, 1976, pp. 11-22).

Van de Graaff, John H., "Can Department Structures Replace A Chair System? Comparative Perspectives." Yale Higher Education Research Group Working Paper YHERG - 46, June 1980.

Veysey, Laurence R., The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965).

Waltzer, Herbert, The Job of Academic Department Chairman: Experience and Recommendations from Miami University (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1975).